



Re: Sensitivity runs for Harbor Pathogen TMDL

Rosella OConnor to: Barbara Hirst, Helen Pang
Cc: Antony Tseng

02/07/2012 08:41 AM

Yes, the boundary would be a steady input at all times. Nothing from Robin yet.

-----"Barbara Hirst" <Barbara.Hirst@dep.state.nj.us> wrote: -----

To: "Helen Pang" <Helen.Pang@dep.state.nj.us>, Rosella OConnor/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

From: "Barbara Hirst" <Barbara.Hirst@dep.state.nj.us>

Date: 02/07/2012 08:05AM

Cc: Antony Tseng/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: Sensitivity runs for Harbor Pathogen TMDL

haven't gotten a final answer here yet, but for the sensitivity run, am I correct that the intent is to have a steady input of the selected value, in other words, in place of 35 all the time it would be 104 (or other selected value) all the time? Also, any details from Robin yet on the boundary input used for model calibration?

>>> Rosella OConnor <OConnor.Rosella@epamail.epa.gov>
2/6/2012 10:09 AM >>>
Hi Barbara and Helen:

Antony and I spoke to Robin regarding boundary assumptions and she will check and get back to us today.

Also, we are considering having the EPA contractor conduct a sensitivity run using the model for 2000 and 2003 at a boundary entero concentration of our choice at Passaic, Saddle, and Hackensack. The choice could be an order of magnitude higher such as 350/100mL. Another choice could be the single sample max (SSM) of 104/100mL. Using the SSM value we think produces a more informed model run on the affect of the boundary condition on the remainder of the Passaic and Hackensack. The thinking here is that whatever variability may exist, it should not exceed the SSM value.

Please let us know which boundary run you would agree to.

Thanks,
Rosella and Antony